LSTA Advisory Committee
Meeting Minutes
WLA Headquarters, Madison, November 11-12, 2009

Wednesday, November 11

Present: Dee Barabe, Roxane Bartelt, Pat Chevis, Garrett Erickson, Becki George, Jeff Gilderson-Duwe, Joan Johnson, Deborah Kabler, Pat Laughlin (telephone), Bea Lebal, Mildred McDowell, Tasha Saecker, Michael Sheehan, and Lynn Stainbrook.

Absent: Jan Adams, Deb Kabler & Rick Grobschmidt (Thursday)

Division Staff: Rick Grobschmidt (Wednesday pm), Mike Cross, Nancy Anderson, Sally Drew, Bob Bocher, Barb Huntington, John DeBacher, Terrie Howe

Also present: Tom Hennen, Debbie Cardinal, Pat Laughlin's dog (via telephone)

Welcome, Opening Remarks, Introductions

The meeting started at 10:02. Pat Laughlin attended via speakerphone. Howe greeted committee members and asked them to introduce themselves.

Public Hearing

Tom Hennen, representing the Waukesha County Federated Library System, asked that the category for adding or including individual libraries to shared Integrated Library Systems (ILS) be resumed. He distributed a written statement. He added that New Berlin and Menominee Falls are not included in their regional shared ILS. He suggested that the larger libraries be funded at $50,000 instead of $35,000. He said that the addition of those libraries would be a valuable addition for resource sharing.

He asked when grant category recommendations are made to the State Superintendent. Howe reported that the categories are finalized in April, 2010. Bocher noted that the category had been "closed" in 2007, but there has been other interest and queries to re-open the category. He reported that 97% of libraries are now in shared systems, and that, while many of the non-participants are smaller, there are some large libraries as well. Hennen said the two in his system had built new buildings and included stand-alone systems. Stainbrook asked whether the two libraries were interested in joining—he reported that it is too early to tell. She related her recent efforts to join OWLSnet, and wondered what Waukesha's Café uses, versus Menominee Falls and New Berlin. He reported that Sirsi-Dynix may be purchased again, but that they are looking at other options, including open source solutions.

Debbie Cardinal distributed materials and discussed Wisconsin Heritage Online (WHO). She urged the committee's use of LSTA funds to allow the Division to take over the administration of WHO. The current WHO board sees that as a logical source for administration. She read a letter that was distributed to the group.

Sheehan asked whether R&LL would take over the project. Drew said they have not discussed it internally, but that would be a possibility. Stainbrook asked whether--money aside--the Division staff believes it would be a good idea to take over the project. Drew said that, administratively, there has

been no discussion, although she has given it some consideration. Johnson asked whether any action is required today. Drew said that not until spring would any action by the committee be required.

Chevis wondered whether the required funding would be entirely from LSTA. Howe asked Cardinal about the budget for the project and what funding might continue. Cardinal stated that the costs are her salary, $5000 for administration, and $10,000 that is now provided for the host support, which is handled by Milwaukee's server. There was also $50,000 in support of harvesting collections through the portal, which was discontinued by the university. The WHO group has looked at other options for harvesting information and resources. Drew reviewed comments from LITAC, where the concept was discussed. There was concern that momentum may be lost if the project discontinued. Also, the Division would not necessarily have to manage the program just as it has been done.

Stainbrook asked why, philosophically, it is a better fit for the Division instead of the State Historical Society. Cardinal said that, previously, the State Historical Society had decided that it was a better fit with them, but that at their last board meeting, the State Historical Society said that they could not sustain the project for the foreseeable future. Cardinal noted that DLTCL has other digitization efforts, and that state libraries in some other states run statewide digitization projects.

Howe directed the committee to other letters that previously had been distributed. One of the letters was from David Weinhold, supporting the WHO project. Another from Stef Morrill, requesting refinement of the Innovative Use of Technology category and funding for further development of shared ILSs. Johnson noted that in the prior meeting the use of the term "Innovative" was discussed as problematic, and that it may be rephrased or repurposed. Krista Ross, chair of the Delivery Services Advisory Committee, submitted comments supporting funding for statewide delivery. Mark Merrifield submitted a letter requesting re-appropriation of the $75,000 for combining shared systems, to purchase a module to link Brown County Library's catalog to the OWLSnet system. Gilderson-Duwe asked Bocher whether he has an opinion about whether the request fits into the broad outlines of the category. Bocher said that the original intent was to include Brown County Library into OWLSnet. The request is different but related. There was no further discussion.

Welcome and Opening Remarks

Howe welcomed the group, and Pat Laughlin's dog.

Cross welcomed the committee and noted that Rick Grobschmidt is at an engagement with the State Superintendent and will join the group after lunch. Chevis asked whether a change would be required to the agenda to allow a new category for Merrifield's proposal, if it were to be considered. Cross responded that tomorrow, during the budgeting process, the committee could suggest funding elements and levels for consideration as they deem fit.

Review of the Agenda

Gilderson-Duwe moved, supported by Chevis, to approve the agenda as submitted. The motion carried.

Stainbrook moved, seconded by Sheehan, to approve the draft minutes of the April, 2009 meeting as submitted. The motion carried.

LSTA Coordinator's Report

Howe reviewed her report and summarized the visit from James Lonergan of the Institute of Museums and Library Services (IMLS) during September. He had a very positive reaction to the Wisconsin program administration and the projects he visited. In his letter that Terrie shared with the group, he re-

emphasized the importance for grantees to acknowledge and recognize IMLS on all materials for the LSTA projects. He also encouraged an operations and procedures manual for the state's program, and gave Michigan's program handbook as an example. Lastly, he said that the State Library Administrative Agency (SLAA) develop a complaint process for the LSTA program with a full description of the process.

DeBacher asked whether the minutes should reflect that LSTA funds administered through the IMLS were used in support of the meeting.

Howe directed members to a handout excerpt beginning, "How the Grants to States Program Works." This is an excerpt from the IMLS publication entitled, "A Catalyst for Change: LSTA Grants to States Program Activities and the Transformation of Library Services to the Public, June 2009." She also noted that the R&LL library's WISCAT program was featured in the report. Cross added comments on the full report and said that a link to the PDF would be sent to committee members.

LSTA Application Overview

Howe noted that the LSTA applications funds requested were slightly lower than reflected in the recent Channel Weekly article.

Cross reviewed the process for review of the categories and proposed projects. He reminded the committee that actual motions for funding and approval should be done tomorrow, but that discussion and questions may be conducted today.

He directed members to the 2010 LSTA Information and Guidelines. In particular, Cross focused on the conflict-of-interest policy page and asked if there were questions or concerns. He noted that the relevant portion is in the middle of the policy, regarding participation, discussion and voting when conflict may occur. DeBacher asked that members indicate when they are abstaining.

Howe referred participants to page 18 of the handbook, outlining the process for the two days of meetings. Recommendations would then be prepared and submitted to the State Superintendent, and notice of award would be distributed in December, assuming funding is not a problem.

Cross reviewed budget issues and the possibility of funding changes, since actual federal appropriations to states have not been made. He referred the committee to the budget summary table and cautioned the committee about any apparent increases that appear. He noted that unassigned funds are not lapsed, since the Division has two years to expend each year's LSTA allocation. He noted that the carryover amount had been estimated in the spring, and that sum is still intact. He noted also that the $75,000 from the BCL/OWLSnet project may be available. Internally, the Division recommended that the funds be unallocated for next year and expended for early projects. He reviewed the budget sheet for DPI internal projects.

Howe directed the committee to the LSTA funding history summary, which is appended to the back of the minutes. She reviewed the materials in the packet.

Internal Operations and Statewide Projects

Public Library Development
Cross noted the pink packet with related agency project and reviewed the categories. The request for Communication & Planning is reduced from $25,000 to $23,000.

Delivery Projects (SCLS, NWLS)
Drew reported that the amount and purpose has not changed from the current year. She outlined the role and activities of the advisory committee. Stainbrook said that the packet report is the same as what

had been submitted in the spring packet. She would like to see, and expects more substantial information, such as the volume, numbers of books, and trends. She felt the committee requires, and she would like to receive, further and additional information.

Drew said that, while she has not routinely recompiled and supplied detailed information, that statistics and information is available on the South Central Library System's (SCLS) delivery website. In her experience, the committee requests for more or less information and that the level of detail requested changes periodically. She noted that the subsidy is just a portion of the actual delivery costs.

Stainbrook said that she is making a broader comment on all the projects, and would like reports on what they have done in the past, as well as the impact. Chevis asked if she means the agency projects as well, or just the competitive projects? She replied that she would like to see it on all the projects. Sheehan asked if that meant having access to the evaluations; she said at least the summaries. Cross noted that in some of the categories there is updated data, and that an evaluation of all the projects is done for IMLS for the internal projects, and by the grantees for the competitive projects. More in-depth evaluations, a 5-year plan and evaluations are required by the IMLS, which comprise a thorough report on all, especially the internal projects. Stainbrook said that it sounded like having access to those reports would not be an additional burden for the committee and she would then be more comfortable and confident with her and the committee's recommendations. Gilderson-Duwe said it sounds like the committee should have access to the 5-year report and evaluation. Howe said that the 2008 evaluation might be a fairly substantial amount of information. Howe reviewed the timeline for reporting; noting that she will summarize and prepare the 2008 report by December this year. Gilderson-Duwe suggested that the report be posted to the website and that the 5-year evaluation be provided to the committee.

LSTA Administration
Howe noted that the category has increased only slightly (Gilderson-Duwe noted a $20 increase), and added that the amount is limited by the IMLS.

DLTCL—Public Library Development: Library Improvement
Mike reviewed the internal expenditures and proposed changes for the category, affected by vacancies and job cuts within the Division. He said that funding for a half-time data collector is included.

DeBacher answered a question from Gilderson-Duwe regarding the scope of the Counting Opinions project and the change that occurred during the two years that FormSoft had been administered by DPI (and then abandoned). Cross clarified the Limited Term Employment (LTE) position in the budget. Gilderson-Duwe asked what the hope is for filling the Data Coordinator position. Cross said that it is likely but when he cannot say.

Public Library Development Technology
Cross reported that the category supports Bocher's position, the CE, and that annual meeting of technology coordinators.

Reference and Loan
Drew noted that the narrative indicates more how the money will be used. She said that a website will be developed to make more information available on how the services are done. She discussed also the abandonment by WiLS of the Virtual Reference service and how that will be assumed by R&LL. However, she will show the costs of R&LL staff for Virtual Reference under that category. She also talked about the changes in the state funding climate for General Purpose Revenues (GPR) funding, and Cross added additional details, that GPR funds have evaporated and costs have had to be reduced or shifted to other sources. He noted that DPI has not revealed where the savings in GPR funds will come from in overall reductions.

Drew outlined budget freezes that include even federal positions. She reviewed the process that Department of Administration (DOA) and DPI are going through for review of all vacancies and position vacancies. There were also reductions in "materials and services" lines, and DPI has not completed how those cuts are distributed, and that R&LL will lose up to $60,000 GPR funding for OCLC services and will have to be moved to LSTA funding. The funds pay for the costs of using the digital archive services, and to receive and send OCLC requests. Resource sharing and the digital archive project will be shifted out to LSTA funds, since they fit the criteria. She will try to mitigate the impact in the 2011 budget cycle. She also learned yesterday that they can fill Terry Wilcox's vacancy, which is interlibrary loan, and half of a reference vacancy. She does not intend to fill those from LSTA funds. The reference position would largely go toward the virtual reference project. There is a third vacancy that has not been submitted, but she will be permitted to submit it; a state position as well, which is the position of cataloger. However, they will decrease the emphasis on building their collection. She reviewed ways in which R&LL's services and focus has and is changing.

Erickson asked why ILL is listed in the Reference & Loan category instead of in the WISCAT category. He asked what the percentage of interlibrary loan was. Drew replied that is a moving target but estimated 20%. Stainbrook asked about the level of questions requested at RLL, and noted that the numbers for reference has gone down. Erickson agreed that there has been a decrease. Drew said she too was surprised that the total number of questions addressed had increased when staffing was down.

Meeting broke for lunch at 12 noon and resumed at 12:45

Rick Grobschmidt returned from the Oak Creek High School, where he attended a Veteran's Day event with the State Superintendent. He thanked the staff and the committee for their work and preparation for the meeting. It has been a good year, in many ways, for libraries, having sustained most of the library system aids, and getting an increase in BadgerLink, which was originally an LSTA project. Also, the employment skills training project, funded with LSTA funds, has paid dividends. He hopes that there will be sustained or even increase LSTA funding at the federal level.

School Library Media Summit

Nancy Anderson reported that there has been a request to increase the summit from the initially proposed $20,000 to $35,000, since there likely will need to be continuing and follow-up work.

Shared Integrated Library System for Schools
Anderson noted that part of the funds from the School Shared ILS project that may be applied here, downplaying the final report and study on that project. Stainbrook asked why the increase was required. Anderson replied that, in looking at the costs for the visioning summit, it was determined that $20,000 would not be sufficient.

Statewide Library Access
Drew reported on the project, although admitted that there has not been much focus on the project so far, with internal vacancies. She said that the UW may assist in a planning project, and has started to develop a draft list of participants. Library Information Technology Advisory Committee (LITAC) has reviewed and discussed options and scope, referring to documentation in a Colorado project, where they are developing procedures and protocols. Stainbrook asked how the $38,000 would be spent. Would it be for meetings and consulting? Drew confirmed, but perhaps some additional actual work for the project may also come from the funds. She did not bring the initial budget. Stainbrook confirmed that it is the outcome of the visioning summit that had been referred to as the "one card" project. Drew reviewed the original proposal from the spring meeting. It included: $8000 for meetings, $10,000 for facilitator, commissioning some concept papers, and $5000 for "other expenses." She said that the concept is still in flux in discussions with COLAND.

Stainbrook wondered if there is still a recommendation from the staff to proceed. Drew said, yes, but there has been intervening circumstances, but that the COLAND is very interested in seeing something done.

Virtual Reference
Drew reported on efforts to assist and offset some of the costs that would have been to public libraries and systems. They are restructuring the relationships between parties, and the changing nature of WiLS involvement. She talked about use of the tool by K-12 students and public information challenges in promoting appropriate use. The promotional efforts for BadgerLink have had some added benefit of public awareness. Restoring staffing should help with promoting and sustaining services as well. WiLS staff will continue to work directly with OCLC staff but otherwise will not be involved.

Web Conferencing Software
DeBacher reviewed needs and expectations

WISCAT
Drew commented on funding levels requested. She discussed changes and developments with Autographics and efforts to increase the scope of the virtual catalog, as well as disappointment in adoption and integration of NCIP, and frustrations with Sirsi-Dynix in not carrying through on developments in the features. While federated searching has been implemented, she still feels that there are limitations and compromises in the accuracy or effectiveness of results. As the virtual catalog develops and expands, there may be less staff requirements and costs for expanding the union catalog.

Stainbrook asked what the overall budget for WISCAT is--Drew replied that another $111,000 comes in from user fees. She clarified a question from DeBacher that the vendor incorporation and adaptation to the standards of NCIP varies considerably, and some elements may not actually work. Garrett asked whether NCIP for OCLC can be adopted. Drew reported that ISO would be used, even though OCLC may be adopting NCIP.

Discussion and Review of 2009 LSTA Applications

External Grant Categories – competitive and noncompetitive

Accessibility
Huntington reviewed the types of projects that have been conducted, and the current proposals. She noted that this category had been proposed to see whether there is need or interest on the part of the systems, and that there is a wide variety of projects.

In addition to the adaptive technologies within libraries, and training, a few projects incorporate door opener retrofits. She noted that some clarification had to be done for door projects and for adaptive computer technologies. Some are supplementing the LSTA funds or requiring a match from the member libraries in order to qualify for the grant funds.

Digitization: Local Resources
Drew reported that the UW will be conducting the projects for the libraries. Vicki Tobias is considering whether they can carry out more of the projects. The reviewers had some major questions about projects that ranked low. The final two were not sufficiently developed or indicated what specific materials would be included. She suggested that those projects following the Indianhead project might be able to be included. Howe pointed out that the category had posed some difficulty since they had requested figures from UWDCC, but did not include those results in the grant application. Tobias had asked that those figures be included, but some of the projects were still unspecific. Drew said that, while

it is good that we had so many applications, the grants nonetheless were not uniformly well prepared. Some might be attributable to the webinar software that was used on a trial basis for training—better training might have led to better proposals. She said that UW could not take 12 proposals; perhaps not even 10 proposals.

Digitization: Large Libraries
Drew reported that three proposals were received. All were, according to her, fund-able. Two are already working with UWDCC. She discussed what is allowable in the category, but also that they could not spend more than what the UWDCC costs would be for comparable work. Milwaukee's proposal needs a few adjustments to bring the request to $10,000 instead of $12,500. Drew requests that Milwaukee's be allowed to go through at that amount ($10,000), and that all three projects be conducted. Gilderson-Duwe pointed out that (with Milwaukee Public Library) a job would be provided for a library student.

Health Information and Access Awareness

Howe reported that reviewers were all from health backgrounds and had many comments about the two grants. Much of the second project would be a survey done through St. Norbert's College. Gilderson-Duwe asked if the Nicolet grant had been questioned or investigated for adjustments.

System Technology Projects
Bocher reviewed typical uses of the grant funds and examples of new applications. He noted some of the restrictions of the Children's Internet Protection Act (CIPA), and the BadgerLink program, to avoid duplication. About half of the systems ask for funding to increase bandwidth (circuit, not Internet access); others enhance the integrated library system; others pay for e-books or other resources not available though the state.

Gilderson-Duwe noted, in comparison to innovative use of technology, that there was some category crossover with some now included in "innovative." Bocher replied that there is nothing in this category that implies or requires innovation. Johnson asked about the Indianhead Library System (IFLS) training for technology and why it was included here instead of in the library development category. Bocher said that discretion is left to the system. Howe asked Bocher to review what the funds may not be used for. He noted that there are databases requested that are not strong in the BadgerLink project. Johnson asked if the grants are automatically approved since they are not competitive. Pearlmutter asked whether the Manitowoc Calumet grant is subject to the filtering requirement. Gilderson-Duwe noted that subsequent language clarifies it.

Innovative Use of Technology
Bocher reported that this is the third year we have had a category called "Innovative." There were nine requests, and, responding to the comments made by Stef Morrill, that some of the applications were not particularly "innovative," some were not really new services or activities that had not been done before. Perhaps, he said, the problem is calling the category "innovative" and trying to determine just what that is. Some may be relative to their region or county. While not "new," the proposals may nonetheless be useful or new to that library or that area.

Gilderson-Duwe asked for confirmation that the grant applications were not required to make a case that the application is innovative, or how they are innovative. He agreed with Morrill that the requirement for establishing and reporting out the activity to the larger community could be useful. Stainbrook said that, what is innovative for one library or system may not be for another. But the library could still make the case for that adoption. Perhaps another term or point-of-view on the category is required. She had some of the same reactions but the grants were well developed. Chevis said that, in

the past, the mindset was that they would be pilot or demonstrations, whereas the projects submitted were all ones that had been done before. Drew said a similar conversation has occurred any time "innovative" has been used in a category. Lebal felt that there would not be anything preventing a library from submitting a project that is truly innovative, but permits libraries to be able to apply. Huntington said similar issues came up in the jobs category. Drew said that, at the federal level, the innovative projects really are research projects and preclude states without the means or resources to do them.

Job Search & Support
Huntington discussed the process of information gathering that led to this category, many of which were innovative to address changing local needs and meeting emergency situations. The category included a number of well developed and creative projects. Some of the current projects included ones where they included additional resources, staff, consulting and training, as well as resources to help communities to help job seekers. The Vista project, where Wisconsin is the only state having Vista's working with job seekers, have also been incorporated into some projects.

In the proposals, she discussed some issues with continuation and the budget in the Lakeshores project, since there is no indication of who will do the trainings with the lab that is included. She recommends that all projects through the South Central project be funded, although that would be $64,190 more than the amount allocated.

Literacy
Huntington reported that some libraries are addressing teen literacy but are partnering with adult literacy councils that are not designed or equipped to assist with that service. Another uses a story wagon designed for children to provide services to teens, where the service is not designed to that level. She recommends that the projects through South Central be funded and that the remaining funds be diverted to the Job Search category.

Multi-type Library Collaboration
Howe said that the Rhinelander project had some functions that really might better be addressed in the jobs category. All projects came with good letters. Reviewers provided some comments on how some could be improved. The amount requested was considerably less than budgeted.

Public Library System Technology
Bocher said nearly a half of the systems are requesting support for their Wide Area Network (WAN). Also, over half request funding for content or databases not supplied through BadgerLink. Many are to provide content provided through WPLC. Others are augmenting their integrated systems for improvements or new releases. Stainbrook asked whether some of the systems are funding the same thing or project year after year. Bocher said that it varies but that some do repeat needs or products. Three or four spend most of their money every year on additional bandwidth.

There were no other questions. Drew noted that there was something wrong with her figures for local digitization making the cutoff at $30,850 using the adjusted figures from Vicki Tobias. Huntington noted that this week there was a teleconference with state agencies regarding job resources. Other states are scrambling to address job needs, and Wisconsin was mentioned several times as having projects and programs that are already up-and-running.

Stainbrook expressed concern that, in the competitive categories, there were fewer dollars requested than funds available. She's sure that there are projects or needs that could have been met but projects were not submitted and she wondered why. Howe replied that libraries are stretched and that they were not in a position to prepare and submit multiple grants.

Stainbrook said that the state does make an effort to get the information out; whether the timetable could be changed or adjusted to make it longer to develop and write a grant. Cross mentioned that the system grants sometimes are effective in making funds available to their smaller libraries. IMLS has made "mini-grants" more difficult since now each sub-grant has to be separately evaluated.

Grobschmidt reported that he will not be available Thursday, since he is leaving on a vacation. He reported that the new State Superintendent has visited several libraries, including Fond du Lac, where their job program was demonstrated.

Cross reiterated that that tomorrow the committee will also consider ideas for categories for 2010. Grobschmidt reviewed the process that takes place in setting the budget, including amendment and subsequent review.

The meeting adjourned for the day at 2:45 p.m.

Thursday, November 12

Howe convened the committee at 8:40 and asked if there were follow-up questions from Wednesday.

Cross explained the process the spreadsheet used, as well as the process used to discuss and establish funding levels.

Final Recommendations on Applications and Allocation of 2010 Funds

Stainbrook moved everything requested, except that $1045 be subtracted from one of the Division projects at their discretion. Chevis seconded the motion. Stainbrook commented that, after reviewing the grant requests last night, all of the grant projects do have a need, and that we should not send a negative message to the libraries that write a grant that, if there are funds available, the grants will be awarded. She asks that the staff work with the libraries on those applications to make sure there are clear goals. The funds are there and the need is there. Gilderson-Duwe opposes the motion, but that cannot vote on such an omnibus motion since he has a conflict on a couple of them. Stainbrook suggested that certain grants could be pulled out separately. Chevis said it could be done category by category and comment then when conditions need to be set. Bartelt agreed. Stainbrook withdrew her motion, with concurrence of the second.

Chevis moved to grant the delivery request at $90,000, Saecker seconded. Passed with Sheehan abstaining.

Gilderson-Duwe moved to fund LSTA Administration at $126,500.

McDowell moved to pass the library media summit at the amount proposed ($35,000). Supported by George. There was no discussion. Motion carried.

Chevis asked Drew to give an updated total for the digitization grant category. Drew replied that all the grants were re-estimated except the bottom two grants that might affect workflow levels. The amount would be $30,850 with all the grants through Indianhead. To fund all the grants would likely be more than UWDCC can handle. Drew asked for a few minutes to consider funding possibilities.

George moved to fund the accessibility and public library system technology at the amounts proposed, seconded by Stainbrook. Gilderson-Duwe, Sheehan, Bartelt abstained.

Stainbrook moved the other items in Library Communications & Planning, Improvement, Multi-type statewide improvement, Chevis seconded. Passed unanimously. George commented that she is pleased that there are some nice things coming out of the Multi-type planning grant.

Chevis moved virtual reference and WISCAT the amounts requested. Seconded by Sheehan. Laughlin make a comment (via phone) that the Virtual Reference is not a good idea now that libraries are furloughing staff at local libraries. The function that should be done locally should not be conducted at the state level. She notes that the job service and support could use extra funding and support and is not in favor of using the funds for virtual reference. The motion carried with one opposed.

Johnson moved that the literacy category be funded with all seven grants being funded, although follow-up with Lakeshores will be necessary, Saecker seconded. The additional funds she suggested could be put toward the jobs category. Huntington expressed some concern about the "tweaking" that may be necessary, since some of the problems with the grant is very fundamental. Chevis said she knows the focus of Storywagon and understands that it doesn't make sense to fund its operations with a project intended for adolescents. Staff acknowledged that they could work with libraries to correct issues, but it will be time-consuming. Gilderson-Duwe said he is more inclined to go along with Huntington's suggestion and deny the project, because the division's duty should not be to manage and hand-hold problematic grants. Stainbrook asked if there is a value to working with system staff grant-writers to improve the grants submitted. Johnson said she could amend the motion to take the last grant out of consideration. George noted that the Lakeshores' literacy and jobs grant were both ranked last. Huntington said it is up to the committee to make recommendations and the division will try to carry them out. Chevis said that, if a bad grant is written, then perhaps it should not be funded. The original motion was six to five, and the motion carried (two abstentions). Cross noted that it is good that the committee's concerns were stated.

Chevis moved, supported by Bartelt, to approve the web conferencing grant as requested. Laughlin asked if it would be compatible with products already being used by systems. Johnson noted that they already use GoToMeeting. George noted that it is a one-year project. The motion carried unanimously.

Gilderson-Duwe whether the full amount proposed for the universal access project is necessary or will be used in 2010. Drew said there really has been no planning or timetable set out yet, and that some components could be deferred.

Drew said that the Digitization-Local Resources could be revised to a total of $45,800 to fund all projects. Stainbrook asked what happens if the UWDCC has more than they can handle. Drew said that they do have to make a decision on how much they can get done, and that we may need to be flexible with them on what they can realistically conduct. Sheehan asked if they would prioritize the current list. Howe and Drew said that they were involved in the review process. Drew said they noted that they are not in a position to evaluate what might be a good grant, or to revise grants. She said that the bottom two would require substantial work to revise, which staff would have to conduct. Saecker moved to fund the grants through Columbus at $35,889. Seconded by Sheehan. Chevis had trouble approving Columbus when their rank was exactly the same as the grant listed below them. Stainbrook said she is glad that there is a separate category for the large projects, so that others can go forward without the UWDCC resources. Stainbrook said she thought that the UW said they thought they could handle ten. Drew said that includes the two in the large library category. Chevis noted that takes through Indianhead on the local resources category. Stainbrook asked what happens if we approve through Columbus and the UW can't handle it. Can a condition be set to not award the additional one if the UWDCC cannot handle it? Cross said that could be accommodated. He also noted that it is not unusual to carry funds over, that funds can be carried over to 2011 if necessary. Lebal said she has a problem splitting two grants with the same rank. Stainbrook asked for clarification— Four in favor, nine opposed to the motion proposed.

Chevis moved to fund through the Waunakee project at a total of $40,889, seconded by Erickson, as long as the UW can accommodate them. Lebal said she is unsure what would happen to those lower on the list if UWDCC can work with more, or can only work on projects through Indianhead. Drew said staff could work with the unfunded grants to be re-submitted next year. The motion carried with nine in favor, no abstentions.

Gilderson-Duwe moved to fund digitization of large libraries at the amount of $29,443, supported by Chevis. Lebal is concerned how these grants are related to the other local resources grants, and how WHO is related, as Deb Cardinal proposed. Drew said that, in some cases, these could be put on an individual Content-DM server, and we did not require them to go with the UW server (except that they would have to submit in the local resources category). The large category is allowed as long as they would not spend more than what a project would cost through the UWDCC method. She described the process under each method, and why the large-libraries category was proposed for next year. Cross asked how it relates to WHO. Drew said that WHO has been an overall planning body for projects, and the metadata harvester. They also work with local historical societies and others that might do their own scanning, so that they can be properly posted and then be able to be harvested for sharing of resources. Lebal asked, if WHO were to be funded in a way that Cardinal suggested, and since libraries have a responsibility to preserve local materials, then WHO could somehow help to support those, but she was unsure how they are related. Drew said that this is the first year in awhile where there are more projects than funds. Drew invited advice for accommodating other projects in another means. Howe asked for a vote. The motion carried with Erickson and Johnson abstaining.

Chevis moved the Health Information Awareness category at the amount of $4800, thereby denying the Nicolet proposal. Gilderson-Duwe seconded. Chevis said she had read the proposal again and felt there were considerable problems and gaps with it, with no goals for the surveys and other details left out. The motion carried with Stainbrook and Sheehan abstaining.

Gilderson-Duwe moved the Jobs Search and Support category at $214,190, funding only those under that amount (though SCLS). Saecker seconded. Carried with Johnson and Sheehan abstaining.

Sheehan moved the Shared Integrated Schools study with Chevis at $5000. Carried unanimously.

Stainbrook, seconded by Chevis, moved to approve the Library Improvement (Development) at $141,400. Motion carried unanimously.

Chevis moved, Johnson seconded to approve R&LL at $703,100. The motion carried unanimously without discussion.

Stainbrook stated she has concern about the Universal Library Access project particularly that the staff do not have time to carry out the project. Perhaps an outside consultant should be hired to carry out the project. Drew said that there was intent to hire an outside facilitator, through the UW. Stainbrook said that her intent is to take some of the load off the staff. Drew said that issues would be identified, and then planning conducted on the prioritized components. She thought that most could be done under a personal services contract, with facilitators working less than 10 days each.

Chevis moved the Universal Library Access at the proposed amount of $38,000; Saecker seconded. The motion carried unanimously.

Chevis moved the Innovative Use of Technology category at $62,461 as requested, seconded by Stainbrook. Chevis noted that, in light of some of Morrill's written comments, the committee should discuss this category for next year and determine whether and how "innovative" is determined. The motion carried with abstention from Sheehan.

The group took a break at 9:55 am and resumed at 10:17 am.

Discussion resumed, started by Stainbrook, who expressed her concern about using LSTA funds for Division projects, feeling that the committee should take a position against the practice, and make efforts to preserve and expand funds available to individual libraries and projects. Lebal agreed; however, the current economic conditions are such that it may not be possible now. In the future, efforts should be made to move the functions away from LSTA funding. Drew pointed out that this is a recurring issue, and that she and the Division have tried repeatedly without success to move services to state funding. BadgerLink has been the exception and been successfully funded with GPR. Nonetheless, Drew and the Division defy the state budget guidelines each year and propose that functions be moved off federal funding to state funding, with little success. Stainbrook is concerned now that another position and function is being moved to LSTA and that, had she known it likely will be permanent, may not have supported it. Bocher said that he wished it could be otherwise, but that in the current budget, even the library system funding had been moved from state funds to special revenue funds, and that over 70% of the positions in DPI are funded with federal funds.

Consideration of Preliminary Categories for 2011

Cross invited the committee to talk about and suggest categories for 2011.

Chevis reminded the committee about the changes that might be made in the Innovative Use of Technology. Perhaps it could be two-tiered; with some being larger projects that are truly innovative and have state-wide impact. Others could be smaller projects that have a local impact, enriching their environment, but may not be necessarily ground-breaking. Perhaps some truly innovative projects could serve as a model, even for other states for leading-edge technology. Johnson said she felt the discussion yesterday seemed to be going in that direction and she agrees.

Sheehan asked what percentage of the projects during the past three years have been truly innovative. Bocher responded, discussing some of the trends (gaming in early years, podcasting), but that some of the other projects were not necessarily innovative when they simply enhanced the shared ILS. Howe asked Chevis what would define "innovative," whether partnership with other libraries or systems would be required. Gilderson-Duwe said that the applicant would have to make the case in their grant for why the project is innovative in their community. Reviewers would need to determine whether they achieved the goal of making a good case. Bocher talked about the instructions to reviews. Gilderson-Duwe suggested including a commitment to disseminate information more broadly at state meetings. Drew said that IMLS has leadership grants and there is considerable language on how the project must be a model and disseminated. SB confirmed that Saecker had presented at a conference on some of her grants. Bocher talked about the showcase programs at WLA and WAPL. Huntington confirmed some that had been included in programs.

Gilderson-Duwe advocated giving the Health Information category one more year to see whether other worthy projects might come in. Howe said it has been difficult getting applicants. Stainbrook expressed surprise with the focus on national health care that there haven't been more applicants. Gilderson-Duwe suspects that the job search category displaced focus on possible Health applications. Huntington concurred from what she heard related to the jobs category. Howe speculates that the libraries are concerned that they may be going beyond their scope with health advice. Johnson noted that previously there were "fit for life" grants administered through Libraries for the Future that Milwaukee has successfully applied for.

Lebal suggested a continuation of the investigation into the WHO project and wondered if it could work together with the other digitization projects. Gilderson-Duwe expressed concern that the Division not take over a project abandoned by the State Historical Society, when the project is so much a historical society area. LSTA cannot take over every project or need that has been orphaned by its funding

sources. The Division should not take on being the liaison to the State Historical Society, when that organization itself has stepped back from the role. Drew said that may be one element but it is not necessarily the whole element. It is not a given that the entire role of WiLS may not be required in a future structure. She said there have been successful projects in the past. She said it could be difficult trying to shepherd the "herd" of local historical societies. Stainbrook adds that the Division could explore some of the project going out in the form of grants to library systems or to WLA, instead of having Division staff doing everything. She thinks of the Universal Library Card project as an example, since they do not have the same procurement requirements. Stainbrook added that any distinct new project could be considered. Drew said the Division had encouraged Systems to take on and coordinate digitization projects. Stainbrook suggested that some functions might be done more economically by systems. Cross mentioned statewide delivery and Gilderson-Duwe added Wisconsin Public Library Consortium (WPLC) as an effort toward statewide coordination outside the Division.

Sheehan commented that the Jobs category be allocated additional funds if it is to be continued. Howe noted that the committee did not foresee what level of need there would be. Gilderson-Duwe noted the partnerships that are fostered by the Jobs categories that will bear fruit into the future. Huntington added that libraries previously had requested LSTA funds for job centers within libraries, as well as literacy. She wonders whether computer labs in themselves would be a worthy project category.

Chevis suggested that Hennen's proposal for reinstatement of the shared systems category. Perhaps it could include joining a shared system or allow enhancement of an existing system. She knows there are other libraries besides the two in Waukesha, or whether there is interest by those libraries. Sheehan wondered what enhancements might be included or how they would be differentiated. Bocher reminded that there are library system block grants and there is nothing preventing systems from using those monies to upgrade their systems.

DeBacher wondered if CIPA would be a consideration for the computer labs. Also that the system upgrades should be capitalized locally, not paid by LSTA. And that the library community was aware that there is a window for joining (shared integrated library systems), what does that do to credibility of the LSTA process if the category is re-opened, after it was closed?

Stainbrook wondered if there would be too many technology categories limiting the amount, scope or focus that the applicants can achieve.

Cross asked for any input on the process or forms used. Stainbrook asked if something could be done more on assisting in the grant preparation. Cross mentioned that Huntington had started to collect and post resources on grant writing, which she noted were elements she had included in instruction she had done. Cross suggested promoting the resource more. Discussion ensured on how to make more resources available, or to have mock reviews of grants proposed. Stainbrook asked who in the room had written an LSTA grant and asked questions of how they had prepared for them. Sheehan said he had relied on the system staff as well as others at the system. Bartelt worked with Barb when she first worked on one. She said also that being a reviewer is invaluable. Lebal said she had worked with system or state-level staff and did look at a few grants. Johnson said understanding the requirements is essential, and that they work together to make their grant program successful. Huntington noted the importance of discussing grant ideas with administration and the board before commencing. Howe said that sometimes you need to start at the back to see what is required before initiating the grant. Gilderson-Duwe said it helps to look at past, highly ranked grants as a model. SB said that it helps to have other successful grant writers review the grant before it is submitted.

Sheehan asked about the current form and whether it could be improved. Howe said that there are limitations to the survey software used and that she also hopes for improvements. Cross asked if the content is reasonable. Bartelt agreed. Huntington talked about perennial problems, such as applicants not being aware of the category guidelines. Howe noted that the guidelines book does not go to each

- 14 -

library; only to the systems. Sheehan says they try to keep libraries informed. Cross noted that there have been concerns when there are categories in which both individual libraries and whole systems that may apply in a competing category. He said the consensus at SRLAAW was to allow for the competition. He noted that in the past there are some categories that were specifically designed for individual libraries. Johnson wondered if there are new directors or others unaware of the grant availability.

DeBacher discussed the "intend to apply" process. Cross did not agree and quickly squelched DeBacher's suggestions and ideas.

Gilderson-Duwe thanked the committee and the Division staff for their help and enjoyed his experience on the committee. Howe noted others whose term is over and Cross invited comments. Bartelt and Lebal agreed that it has been a good experience. McDowell also thanked the group.

Howe discussed possible dates for the next meeting in the spring. No date worked well in everyone's schedule. A survey of dates will be sent out to the committee.

Howe adjourned the meeting at 11:30 a.m.